DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 083 HE 001 409

AUTHOR	Bennis, Warren G.
TITLE	[Living in a Temporary Society.]
INSTITUTION	College Entrance Examination Board, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Oct 69
NOTE	10p.; Address delivered to the Annual Meeting of the College Entrance Examination Board, New York, N.Y., Oct. 27-28, 1969
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.60
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Change, *Educational Responsibility, *Higher Education, *Institutional Role, Responsibility, *Social Problems, Social Values, Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Society is in the process of accelerated change and the institutionalization of this change through research and technology. Other factors affecting American society are an increase in affluence, an elevation of the educational level of the population, and a growing interdependence of institutions. The fact that this country is currently going through the second phase of the Industrial Revolution is characterized by: (1) the growing number of people working in the service area; (2) the increasing size of the professional-technical class of labor; (3) the changing population characteristics of professional and technical personnel; and (4) the increased dependence on research and theory. Two revolutions are going on simultaneously; the underprivileged are seeking liberal reform, and individuals are looking for a moral change in social values. These forces challenge traditional authority, and institutions such as the university must develop the ability to cope with these changes. Most particularly, universities must include in their curricula (1) the competence to cope with information overload, and (2) the competence to deal with the affective, emotional, interpersonal aspects of education. (AF)

ED038083

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION BOARD
Annual Meeting, New York City
October 27-28, 1969

ADDRESS BY WARREN G. BENNIS, VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT, STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO

I start off today with an unnamed speech. Several months ago when I was asked to come here, I was sent a letter asking for the title of the speech I would give. The title I gave was "Living in a Temporary Society." I thought I would discuss some elements of that with some implications for the group here today. I suppose that the title still remains, although I hope, as I go along, it will become clearer as to what I mean by "living in a temporary society."

I want to start by mentioning that I come before you in a somewhat more confused state of mind than when I wrote the book (about two or three years ago) with my co-author Phil Slater.

My confusion, I think, really stems from two basic sources that I want to indicate to you by way of helping you understand my disorientation as well as some of my biases.

First, while writing the book, I was a professor and did a lot of research and consulting. In the last two and a half years, I have been a university administrator; in that capacity I have had to take some embarrassing looks at the things I have written about motivation and change (areas in which I was something of an expert), only to discover that it was much easier to advise, consult and research these matters than to be involved in them. As a matter of fact, I've been keeping a kind of log, or diary, with a double-entry bookkeeping system, where on the one hand I had theories and, on the other hand, I had the actual practice. It was an exercise in masochism. My faculty frequently remind me of this since they have read what I've written, and they particularly like to indicate to me the interesting incongruities they often dig up.

This relationship between knowledge and theory, action and research, is a fascinating one. I am sure you all deal with this every day.

I remember how struck I was before making what, for me, was a significant and personal decision some three or so years ago, when I was deciding whether I wanted to leave M.I.T. and the Boston-Cambridge area (which I now think of as the Roman Empire) and go off to what I then considered the Far West -- Buffalo, New York. I went through an acute Hamletic phase, where I really didn't know what I wanted to do. I felt nobody could answer my question or help me.

One day I decided to simply talk to a friend of mine to see if he had a cognitive theory to help me. He is a world expert on decision theory, so I thought he ought to apply one of his methods to me. I went to visit him and presented my problem -- Buffalo -- you know -- versus administration -- and so on. And he said, "Hell! Don't ask me! I was in the same situation you're in several years ago, and I went to see my dean, and asked him, 'What would you do, what do you think I ought to do?' He said, 'Why don't you use one of your models on yourself?' I said, 'Yes, but this is important!'" That discussion has haunted me ever since.

The other basic confusion -- and I am quite serious about this, is the external events which have occurred since parts of the book, The Temporary Society, were written. Changes which I want to explore as I go along, and changes which have me

HE001 409

confused and in some conflict. In light of this, I thought what I had best do in my talk today is to try at least to clarify what it is that confuses me about society and education and issues that affect all of us -- the kind of lives people lead.

The whole basis of the book, The Temporary Society -- and "Living in a Temporary Society" -- really had to do with certain changes happening in the environment and what the consequences of those changes would be, or might be, and what those changes might lead to in terms of life, institutions, relationships and leadership. So what I would like to do today is to mention not all, but some of the key changes occurring in society, and after that, go on to talk about some of the consequences I think these changes are producing and what implications they might have for education, and then conclude on a dilemma I have been thinking and puzzling about.

There are several features of the environment I'd like to touch on. One of these is so obvious that I almost hesitate mentioning it before this group because it has become something of a cliche. It is the accelerated rate of change itself, and not only the accelerated rate of change, but also the institutionalization of change through research, particularly, and science research and development, as well as technology.

The trouble with cliches is they often blind us to their real impact.

I often ask my students to read a newspaper of the date of their birth, and then try to map out whatever changes they detect. That is usually an exercise of interest and meaning for them.

I would also urge some of you to read a college catalogue of about thirty years ago and see how marvelously comforting it was then -- how easy things appeared. I did this recently. I looked up the 1916 catalogue of the University of Buffalo and was refreshed by nostalgia. Freshmen wore beanie caps -- and were supposed to rise and give their seats to women in trolley cars!

Changes in history (not just the statistical horror stories we read in the Sunday supplements, like the fact that by 1980 there will be four billion people), such as the rate of physiological development, have been changing fantastically. It has been estimated that people are growing up, maturing biologically and physically, at a rate of about six months per decade. A child entering school in 1969 is three years more developed physiologically than his or her grandparents were sixty years ago.

Or, take Robert Oppenheimer's great crack about the Physical Review: If it keeps expanding at its present rate, it will weigh more than the earth by the year 2000!

This is the American experience. I don't have time to go into history, except to mention that American history has been convulsive ever since the beginning: 1) the European transplants who came from Europe to settle this place, 2) the movement to the frontier, 3) the tremendous immigrations in the late 1800s and early 20th century, and 4) underlying all of these changes, has been the steady pneumatic beat of technology, which has its own momentum and which, very much like a juggernaut, has made extraordinary changes in American life.

Americans have a persistent trait, which is never to leave an idea alone.

Americans have a knack of wanting to make an idea work -- like the laser, which won the Nobel Prize in 1963, was invented in the late '50s, and will be a three-billion dollar business by 1970. You can think of other examples like that. Americans like to make ideas work.

Mobility is fantastic too. One out of every five American families moves every year. Executives move very quickly. There have been recent studies done on the extraordinary mobility rate among Americans, particularly executives and other people, in institutions and, increasingly so, students. One of the big things in such an industrial temporary society is that people move a lot all the time; they expect it.

You can compare that with a country like Turkey, or a village in a country like India -- stable, placid -- even forecastable -- nonturbulent. There was a study done of Turkey, where social scientists came around and asked the Turkish villager the following question: What would you do if you had to leave your village -- move from your village? Most of the villagers simply couldn't answer the question. They didn't have the imagination to think of what life would be like outside their village. Of those that could answer it, the average response was, "I'd rather be dead than leave my village."

Can you imagine a vital American executive today telling his boss at IBM, "I will not leave Poughkeepsie to go to Chicago to take that better job -- I'd rather be dead." You know, these days "IBM" is the acronym for "I've Been Moved."

So the key change is the fantastic accelerating rate of change.

Then there is increased affluence. We know that there are book titles on this kind of thing. Increase, in real terms, of average family income compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, shows that between 1965 and 1980 it's going from $7,000 to $10,500, and disposable income is going from 2400 to 3600.

One key thing about the generation gap is the attitude toward money. I just wanted to indicate this now, because I think this is one of the main differences in orientation.

Then, of course, there is the increase in formal education, with about 7-1/2 million in college -- a more educated society.

Fourth is the growing interdependence of institutions. Boundaries are blurring -- more political power and government power intertwined. It is almost ridiculous for people to think that the university can be a sanctuary, occasionally throwing in shells but primarily staying out of the action. This is ridiculous because of the way this society is going, and also, because the university has always been involved with society one way or another; and, society and universities serve each other's needs.

I know in Buffalo how important it is to understand Buffalo politics because the election of the next mayor is terribly important for the stability, the peace, and the tranquility of my university. You have got to be and can't help but be involved, because the evaluation of the university is that which leads to legitimization and financial support of the university.

So, growing interdependence.

Then, we have a post-industrial society or, as some people would call it, the

second phase of the Industrial Revolution. A post-industrial society essentially contains three characteristics:

One is that there are more people working in the service area. This is happening. Again, consult the Bureau of Labor Statistics. By 1975 the great majority of the American people will be working in service and non-production areas of American life.

I noticed recently a peculiar trend in the School of Business. In 1928, in our University, 70 percent of the kids were going into business when they left the university. Five years ago, 39 percent were going into business, and now 14 percent expect to go into business when they leave the University.

I was stunned recently, in talking to the graduating class of the Administrative Sciences Department at Yale, only to discover that only one was going into industry (one in a group of 25) -- this one was an interesting fellow who had been sent there. I later learned this was a marvelous admissions idea -- he was a member of the Mafia, and the Mafia sent him there to learn more about administrative science. He was the only one going back into industry.

A second characteristic is the number of professional-technical class entering the labor world -- the experts -- call them what you will -- those with the knowledge that leads to action -- I'm referring to the growing affinity between the men who write history and the men who make it.

Third, innovation becomes increasingly dependent on theoretical knowledge, on theories and research. No longer will we have the homegrown inventor, like a Tom Edison or a Charles Kettering. The inventors today will be the Charles Townes, the physicists, the mathematicians, and so on.

Finally, with regard to environmental changes, are the population characteristics:

By 1975, two-thirds of the net increase of population will occur in the 20 to 23 age group, in the better educated class, and with more women and more Negroes. Their growth is half again as fast as whites and men in the growing segment of the professional and technical personnel in our society.

There are many other changes that I have not mentioned, such as urban problems, confrontations between black and white, the young and the old, between countries, and so on. These, I think, are the main characteristics of the environment, that have enormous implications for any human enterprise. The enterprises we are most concerned with here are schools, high schools and higher education.

Let me turn now to the consequences.

John Gardner has perhaps been the most pungent and eloquent spokesman about the effects of rapid change and mobility on our institutions - e.g., their sluggish and unadaptive quality. He wrote that departments of federal government are in great need of renewal; that state government in most places is a 19th century relic; that courts are crippled by hierarchy and profit; that each corporation is stunted by its own impenetrable web of vested interests.

It is pretty clear to me that what passes for organization in most corporations, that which is called, pejoratively, "bureaucracy," is really out of date. Every age

develops an organizational arrangement that is appropriate to its genius, and it is becoming very clear that for many reasons the bureaucratic structure (the centralization of power, fairly clearcut and narrow roles, where all policies are foreshadowed to account for all contingencies) cannot cope with present-day realities. Bureaucracies are marvelous institutions in a stable world, where you know pretty much what the world is going to be like tomorrow.

Bureaucratic structures, for many reasons, cannot stand up to the pressing demands, the new values, the complexity of people's needs, and the turbulent dynamics in the environment. The university is a beautiful example of just how the bureaucratization, in many cases, is diminishing the growth and development of the institutions.

We have in the university a marvelous device called "the department." It was magnificent and so omnipotent of God to think that knowledge could be broken down into convenient categories. It simply doesn't work like that. There are departments of economics who hired agricultural economists during a time when agriculture was about 50 percent of the gross national product; it now accounts for about 5 percent. These agriculture economists have tenure, and stay on teaching agricultural economy to a student population who are fascinated with urban economics, health economics, educational economics, economics of research and development and economics of science -- and they can't get it.

What we are trying to do at the University of Buffalo -- this is a sort of footnote to the temporary society -- is develop new forms within the institution, new temporary systems, formed to work on problems like urban systems, water pollution, the drug problem, bio-engineering, or whatever mixture of interesting combinations come together; to focus on things like peace, traffic, or what have you, and to develop these task-force temporary systems, to work with students and keep them concentrating on the these problems. When the problem seems to get less interesting, less potent, less salient, and possibly even solved, the members of the team, this temporary system, dissolve and return to their own departments, or form new teams. Temporary systems, helping the institution adapt to changing conditions so that the institution can remain responsive to what is going on out there; I think that universities in particular are very difficult to build in this direction.

It was once said a university was harder to move than a cemetery, and it is true. Most people in departments are in a marvelous state of security. In a declassed society, especially in American universities, being a professor, a psychologist or a sociologist, is almost equivalent to having a religion.

Sociologically, it is hard for Americans to consider working on things that don't have professional status, because, in effect, it means giving up something socially very important for them.

Temporary systems first affect decay, stodginess, and rigidity in institutions. The second important consequence is the decline in the acceptance of traditional authority. I would have to spend a lot of time on this, but simply it is the decline of tradition as a basis of authority.

The big difference between Berkeley "protests" and Columbia "riots" was that in the former case, pre-Columbian people were saying, "You, in power, are abusing or misusing authority." In the Columbia case, what they said is that You do not have legitimacy -- a big difference!

One is basically liberal reform; the other is basically radical. Right now, in our society, there are two extremely potent revolutionary forces. One has to do with the demand for emancipation by people who regard themselves as subjugated, underprivileged, deprived, whatever words you use, people like the "third world" -- the marijuana smokers, the draft age youth, the Lesbians, the Welfare recipients, the opponents of war -- the many groups who simply say unless you are in fact one of us, you have no right to rule, govern or legislate my life.

Equally important is the second revolutionary force -- those individuals, particularly youth forerunners, who are asking for a major moral reform of personal and organizational life, and these are usually the privileged youth who are looking not for full enployment but full lives.

Kenniston has written about the two revolutions going on. One is essentially those people who are looking to break the bonds of subjugation and revolution. The other involves those people who may have graduated from high school in Scarsdale, who come from middle class parents, and are not looking for entrance into the system but are looking for a revolution of social values, a personal-centered society. Both of these forces are right now challenging traditional authority.

I believe change is an underlying cause of this. In stable societies it is quite obvious to say that adults know more. In rural France (which doesn't change very much), a French farmer "knows more" than his son. In India, an Indian villager knows more about life than his son and knows more about the life that his son is going to lead. However, this is no longer true in our society.

I realize how nostalgic I, myself, feel when I recall the times I was helped with my mathematics homework by my father, realizing full well how I am not going to be able to do the same for my children. They are very young now, five, three and one, but that time will come and I won't be able to help them. The other day, in the bookstore, I noticed a book called, "Modern Mathematics for Parents of Children Taking Modern Mathematics."

Along with this decline in traditional authority, there is a very interesting, I think, and at the same time a very destructive rejection of verbal and quantitative symbols by the young, particularly.

We have a bulletin board course in Buffalo where, if twenty students sign up for a special course on the bulletin board, no matter what it is, and we can get a professor to teach it, that course will be mounted and credit given. It is interesting to look at this bulletin board course, because it reflects what a lot of young people in universities seem to be wanting. I was stunned to discover that the most popular course requested was one called "World Comparative Religions," which I think again betrays a termendous need for some transcendental, spiritual, deeply non-verbal and non-quantitative experience.

"Cooking" was a surprise choice. Many people again, I suppose, are reacting against words. "Guerrilla Warfare," of course, was high on the list. "Psychedelic Experiences" and "Sensitivity Training," not just verbal but non-verbal, were specifically asked for.

In the arts, we can see the same kinds of traditions, but what we are facing right now in this world in many quarters, from the young (especially the young privileged class) is a desire to express <u>feelings</u> rather than words, to want <u>experience</u> rather than equations, to want reality, to "tell it how it is," and to tell it <u>now</u>.

I suspect, though I am not sure, that this is because for many young, the past looks bleak, for this country in particular. As they view us, the Establishment, we are a violent society of institutional violence, indeed, of genocide; all of you have heard the litany, the rhetoric and the feelings, a past that is noxious, and a future in which I may not exist: the nuclear Damocles sword hanging over our heads.

I read just the other day that Arlo Guthrie, the son of Woody, has this restless, shifting, uprooted urge to keep searching for new communities, looking for new Woodstocks, looking to find community and love and trust -- restlessly, he keeps moving on. I discovered also that Woody Guthrie, Arlo's father, died of Huntington's Disease, and Arlo Guthrie, now young, in his twenties, won't know until he is 35 if he has that same terrible disease that destroyed Woody.

I think of the Guthries as the way many young people see their own lives -- this tremendous desire to find a community, a home, and yet shuffling off and moving from place to place. Perhaps not unlike our executives, but a different form of search, a personal, communal quest.

I think this is what will happen, at least to part of our modern education, the development of more Woodstocks -- for credit. Friends of mine are now starting -- oh, the wonder of it! -- a "Commune Consulting Corporation." It sounds wild, but they are in business, and they are making money, because quite often people who want to start communes are least equipped to know how to develop a commune that really works.

There's another significant consequence and that is change in motivation patterns. I note that where we have economic affluence, where we have decline in traditional authority, it seems to change motivation. Putting it in a very homespun way, when you have enough food in your stomach, enough security and safety needs provided for, then you move on to a higher need. This is Abraham Maslow's theory and many of you here know it well. The point is that once you have enough -- the money, the clothes -- they are no longer "motivators." I think it was Shaw who said that a friend of his had to study war in order for his son to study business in order for his son to study art.

So many members of our society are now so affluent, they are looking for different kinds of things to motivate them, things so vague as a search for self-realization and becoming fuller human beings.

I see this very much at the university right now. We find it very difficult to recruit people simply on the basis of money, fringe benefits, the context of the job, or the office. These are all terribly important, yes, and when not present can be very dissatisfying, but they never lead to real satisfactions.

Some recent studies on motivation reveal there are two factors in motivation, one is called "hygienic," i.e., the pay, the space, the cleanliness. At best, they reduce dissatisfactions to zero. They never make people happy, or alive, or filled with zest or self-esteem.

There are other things like recognition, and achievement, and getting a kick out of the intrinsic aspects of the job. This is what makes people happy. Without these, a person can be at a point of low dissatisfaction and not really alive about anything else.

This can be seen in the university today. We need to provide for people a

place where they can think and continue to learn. Thus, what we are trying to do at the University is to develop a supergraduate school, a place where people can expect their own professional development to be enhanced. What we are sensing is an increase in the proportion of growth-motivated persons, people who are not just simply looking for reduction of dissatisfactions, but an increase of satisfactions as well.

Incidentally, I don't know if we have any union members here today, but as a liberal who has always supported labor unions, I have always felt that one basic mistake labor unions in this country have made is that they did not understand the distinction between that which leads to lowering dissatisfaction and that which leads to increasing satisfaction. The unions have had very little success in professional areas, because their essential task is dealing with the context of the job and not its content. They have not dealt with those things which really make people alive and happy.

I believe this has led to (and perhaps I will end with this dilemma) a general shift in values. Keep in mind that when I speak, I am talking essentially about the affluent group and not the role of the excluded impotent populations. As a matter of fact, I wanted to say earlier that there is a fantasy I have about these two revolutions -- the poor black and the affluent white. The fantasy is that if Karl Marx had had a Black Student Union member on one hand, and a white SDSer on the other hand, and they were overlooking the industrial might of Pittsburgh, and if he were to say, "Comes the revolution, gentlemen, that city will be yours," I think that the black might want to get into it and the white would like to reject it, because he is, again, interested not in tne employment, in the productive features, but rather in the other things I mentioned.

I see a shift in values. I wrote this in The Temporary Society: a shift from achievement on the basis of the Protestant ethic in society, to self-actualization; a shift from self-control to self-expression; a shift from independence to interdependence; a shift from the endurance of stress to the capacity for drive; and a shift from full employment to full lives.

It sounds as if I am talking about -- and, indeed, I mean it this way -- the end of the Protestant ethic. The Protestant ethic, in large part, emphasized self-control, independence, the postponement of gratification, and achievement. I think that these are the very things that are going through extraordinary transition today.

I used to argue that there are two kinds of competencies people need for leadership. I now argue that these are the two kinds of competencies universities ought to be dealing with and that need to be included in the curriculum.

One is the competency to cope efficiently, imaginatively, and perceptively wtih information overload, with the extraordinary amount of information to which people are exposed these days. I had the feeling Marx's power was based on property, but today it is based on information. It is a totally different concept of power.

The second major competency falls into the emotional, interpersonal or affective area of education. Now, by and large, it is not altogether legitimate for universities to be dealing with the thing called affective or emotional education. As a matter of fact, in some places it is often called a "Communist plot" -- a way that white Bolsheviks use to brainwash people. Emotional (affective) education, I feel, is important for a variety of reasons, chief among them being the terrible importance of people recognizing their moral, ethical, emotional sense in human institutions; otherwise, we develop a society of people who do what they are told because they are told to do it.

I wish I could end on a note of certainty.

It strikes me that there are two kinds of futures which I believe are related, but not clearly, with the two kinds of revolutions I was talking about, both of which may happen. I am not sure we even have to choose, but both are possible, and both cause confusion in planning, in selecting students, in developing curriculum, and in the leadership of our land.

The one prediction we can make about this world, at this time, in its most radical transitional stage -- because we are involved in that right now -- would be the second phase of the industrial society, and this is essentially where my book, The Temporary Society, ended, essentially at the point where science and technology would solve almost all human problems.

For example, what effect will increased knowledge in bio-engineering have on human values? Or, how do we understand pollution, or poisoning by chemicals, or traffic congestion? All the ecological traps we are presently involved in. It is thought that these problems can be solved by a higher form of technology.

One other aspect of the second phase Industrial Revolution is the ordination of large scale, centralized organizations, the way we have them now, but bigger, where private and public sectors become even more blurred. Cybernetics, which is a marvelous invention for doing away with slavery in our society -- a society without slaves. Leisure will be more inviting than the job itself. Research and services will play a more dominant role. A meritocratic elite. A technological structure, where credentials will be more important.

But I see another kind of future developing -- which sometimes interferes with the former vision of what I wrote about in my book, the second phase of the industrial society. It is something that can be called organic populism. In this case we have a system that is responsible to the larger social purposes of society. In the organic populist society the main strategy for truth, the main vehicle for discovering whether something is valid, will be one's experience, one's self-expression, or social experience, whereas the major strategy for truth in the second phase Industrial Society will be construct or service.

In this organic populist society, failure at work will not be equated with failure as an individual. In other words, people can fail at work, they can fail in their grades, but they will not be considered a personal failure. Learning in this society will be an end in itself, and there will be the deliberate experience for fulfillment of human potentiality, because it requires quite a different approach from that solely bent on the control of natural forces.

In the organic populist society there will be more planning done by those who are supposed to execute the plans. Credentials and degrees will be less important in the organic populist society. Personal style, capability of continuous self-renewal, and self-understanding will be the chief criteria for success. Distinctions between formal and informal education will become blurred. It will not be work versus education, or work versus leisure, but work, education, and leisure versus killing time. And so our curriculum in an organic populist society will include art and science of becoming fully human.

I thought at one time that I was a post-industrial, second-phase, industrial society man. That was the whole basis of life in a temporary society. I now see two possibilities emerging. They may coexist, although it is very difficult

sometimes to bring these two life styles together. But it is this kind of issue which is explosive and is the revolutionary issue right now in a modern university like Buffalo -- the issue between these two different styles, the post-industrial style and the organic populist style. I think it important to consider when we make choices, which of these two kinds of models our institutions are reinforcing -- in admissions, for example, in the kind of decisions we make in the institution, and in federal policy. It may be that we don't have to choose.

I want to end with a story that came to mind about this kind of choice, the conflict that I now see emerging in American life, not just in the university, but between organic populist and post-industrial models.

When I was a graduate student in psychology, each student had to take one patient for an hour a week. I had a patient who was quite ill. He had ulcers and was very depressed. His marriage wasn't going well. He was a rough case -- a fellow who just wasn't happy at all. As it turned out, he saw his conflict then as between his early background and his present life. He was brought up in an environment where there was no drinking, a child of stern, protective parents. He then took a job as a traveling salesman and discovered in his work that he really liked drinking and playing around, and in his own mind, in his own self-diagnosis, that was what was causing his conflict.

I said to him, "You know, you've got this parental value system and your own present fulfillment wishes, and you had better choose between them." He nodded and said, "Yes, I'll think about it. I'll come back next week."

Next week he came back smiling, looking happy, and so on, and I said, "Well, it looks to me like you've made a choice. What did you decide to do?" He said, "Oh, I've decided to keep my conflict."

END

DEPT. OF HEALTH
EDUCATION AND
WELFARE

U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION

ERIC

DATE FILMED

7-30-70